

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed February 14, 2006. Claims 1, 8, 11, 29, and 53 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-12, 14, 18-31, 34-41, 53-61, 63-65, 67-68, and 70-73 remain pending. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the application and specifically on page 9 lines 7-9 (outer perimeter of the base is frustoconical); page 10 lines 14-15 (cover includes a recessed area); page 10 line 17 and Figure 12 (structure integral with the cover); and page 11 lines 4-28 (suppression station includes at least one insect suppression device). It is believed that no new matter is presented by these amendments.

Interview Summary Record

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy shown to Anneliese S. Mayer in the interview of July 11, 2006. Possible amendments to the claims were discussed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 Second Paragraph

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-12, 14, 18-31, and 34-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action points out that the insect suppression devices have not been positively claimed. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claims 1, 29, and 53 to call out at least one insect suppression device. It is understood that the insect suppression station can include one insect suppression device or two insect suppression devices. In the case where the station includes one insect suppression device, the device may be located in either the first or second area for receiving the insect suppression device. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action has rejected several claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Johnson et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1, 29, and 53 to call out a base where the outer perimeter of the base is frustoconical. Applicants have also called out that cover includes structure integral with the cover configured to retain the insect suppression device. Applicants believe that these amendments distinguish the present invention over Johnson et al. which is uses feet and does not disclose structure integral with the cover. As Applicants have pointed out, feet are undesirable because they create a harborage for insects. Because the outer perimeter of the base of the present invention is frustoconical, water is deflected away but the device is flush with the wall so that it does not provide a harborage for insects. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,768)

The Office Action has rejected claim 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 1 to call out a base where the outer perimeter of the base is frustoconical. Applicants believe that this amendment distinguishes claim 1 and all of the claims depending from claim 1 from Johnson et al. for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,768) further in view of Pleasants (U.S. Pat. No. 6,272,791)

The Office Action has rejected claims 26-28 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson et al. further in view of Pleasants. Applicants respectfully traverse

this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 1 and 29 to call out a base where the outer perimeter of the base is frustoconical. Applicants believe that this amendment distinguishes claims 1 and 29 and all of the claims depending from claims 1 and 29 for the reasons discussed above with respect to Johnson et al. Pleasants does not correct the shortcomings of Johnson et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Demarest (U.S. Pat. No. 4,841,669) in view of Snell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,378,243)

The Office Action has rejected claims 1 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Demarest in view of Snell et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 29, and 53 to call out that the cover includes a recessed area. Claim 1 specifically calls out that the cover includes a second area for receiving an insect suppression device and that the second areas includes (1) a recessed area and (2) structure integral with the cover. Demarest does not disclose a cover with a recessed area and structure integral with the cover. Snell et al. does not correct the shortcoming of Demarest. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Extension of Time

It is noted that a three-month extension of time is needed for timely response to the above-identified Office Action. A request for such an extension is submitted herewith.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is kindly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Anneliese S. Mayer, at (651) 795-5661, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.



Respectfully submitted,

ECOLAB INC.
Law Department
Mail Stop ESC-F7
655 Lone Oak Drive
Eagan, Minnesota 55121
Phone Number: (651) 795-5661
Fax Number: (651) 204-7507

Dated: July 24, 2006

By: /Anneliese S. Mayer/
Name: Anneliese S. Mayer
Reg. No. 54,434